shine like precious stones. It was a pleasure to look upon the graceful out lines of her form, and the majestic carriage of her head. She delighted him most when in a frolic. Her extreme gracefulness and agility, as she glided along jumped, bounded, and rolled over and over, was truly surprising. When she was darting up the rocky eminence at her swiftest speed, she would stop suddenly and beautifully, as the Frenchman called "Mignonne."

One day a very large bird sailed through the air over their heads. In the desert, anything that has life is intensely interesting. The Frenchman quitted the panther to watch the flight of the bird, as he slowly and heavily fanned the air. In a few minutes Sultana began to growl. "She is certainly jealous," thought the soldier, as he looked at her fierce and glittering eyes. They gazed intelligently at each other, and the proud coquette leaped as she felt his hand upon her head; her eyes flashed like lightning and she shut them hard.

"The creature must have a soul," exclaimed the Frenchman.

This account was given me by the soldier himself, while I was admiring the docility of the powerful animal in the menagerie at Paris.

"I did not know," continued the narrator, "what I had done to displease Mignonne so much, or whether the creature was in mere sport, but she turned and snapped her teeth at me, and seized hold of my leg. She did it without violence, but thinking she was about to devour me, I plunged my dagger into her neck. The poor creature rolled over, uttering a cry that froze my heart. She made no attempt to avenge my blow, but looked mildly upon me in her dying agony. I would have given all the world to have recalled her to life. It was as if I had murdered a friend. Some French soldiers who discovered my signal, found me some hours after, weeping by the side of her dead body."

"Ah, well" said he, after a mournful silence, "I have been in the wars of Germany, Spain, Russia, and France, but I never saw anything that produced such sensations as the desert. Oh, how beautiful it was!"

"What feeling did it excite?" asked I.

"Things that are not to be spoken," said the soldier, solemnly. "I do not always regret [illegible] of palm trees and my panther; but [illegible] their remembrance makes me sad. [illegible] there is everything, and there is [illegible]

"[illegible] you mean by that?"

"[illegible]ell," he said, impatiently. After [illegible] added, "God is there without man?"

HOME.

"[illegible]y joys, are passing lovely;
[illegible]ranger heart can tell."

[illegible] rests on the endearing name [illegible] consecrated by domestic love that [illegible] of human happiness. Without this, [illegible] would be like a temple stripped of its garlands; [illegible] another welcomes with loud affection; a mother's kind sympathies comfort in the hour of distress, and assist in every trial; there a pious mother first taught the infant lips to lisp the name of Jesus; and there a loved sister divides the companion of early years.

Truly, if there is aught that is lovely here below, it is home—sweet home! It is like the oasis of the desert. The passing of our days may be painful; our path may be checkered by sorrow and care; unkindness and frowns may wither the joyousness of the heart, efface the happy smiles from the brow, and bedew life's way with tears, yet when the memory hovers over the past, there is no place in which it delights to linger as the loved scene of childhold's home! It is the polar star of existence. What cheers the mariner, far away from his native land in a foreign port, or tossed upon the bounding billows, as he paces the deck at midnight alone—what thoughts fill his breast? He is thinking of the loved ones far away at his own happy cottage; in his mind's eye he sees the smiling group seated around a cheerful fireside. In imagination he hears them uniting their voices in singing the sweet songs which he loves. He is anticipating the hour when he shall return to his native land, to greet those absent ones so dear to his heart.

Why rests that deep shade of sadness upon the stranger's brow, as he seats himself amid the family circle? He is surrounded by all the luxuries that wealth can afford; happy faces gather round him, and strive in vain to win a smile! Ah! he is thinking of his own sweet home; home, of the loved ones assembled within his own cheerful cot.

Why those tears which steal down the cheeks of that young and lovely girl, as she mingles in social circle? Ah! she is an orphan; she, too, had a happy home; its loved ones are now sleeping in the cold and silent tomb. The gentle mother who watched over her infancy, and hushed her to sleep with a lullaby, which a mother only can sing, who in girlhood days taught her of the Saviour, and tuned her youthful voice to sing praises to his name, has gone to the mansions of joy above, and is mingling her songs, and tuning her golden harp, with bright angels in heaven. Poor one! She is now left to thread the golden path of life, a lonely, homeless wanderer.

Thus it is in this changing world. The objects most dear are snatched away. We are deprived of the friends whom we most love, and our cherished home is rendered desolate. "Passing away," is engraved on all things earthly. But there is a home that knows no change, where separation never takes place, where the sorrowing ones of this world may obtain relief for all their griefs, and where the sighs and tears of earth are exchanged for songs of unending joy. This home is found in heaven.

In the shadowy past, there is one sweet reminiscense which the storms of life can never wither; it is the recollections of home. In the visioned future, there is one bright star whose lustre never fades; it is the hope of home—of a heavenly home.—*Musical Visitor*

THE FLIGHT OF TIME.

The flight of time is mystic and wonderful. It has often been compared to the daily round of the sun—that is, so far as it may be contrasted with the life of man. The rising of the orb of day, with beauty, in silence, and with power, may be compared to the morning of life—the period when the heart pictures what the fancy draws—the period when our hopes are strong, and all our paths are pleasantness and peace." The meridian splendor of the noon day sun may be linked unto the meridian of man's life. All his faculties are in full bloom; all his powers of mind and body fully developed. There is one more comparison still. The evening of man's life can be most aptly compared to the setting sun. Like a warrior taking his rest—like a traveller who has borne the heat and burden of the day, his life goes out quietly and noiselessly, even as the setting of the powerful king of day."—*Southern Baptist*

RAISING OF DROWNED PERSONS

Why fire cannon or guns to raise a drowned body to the surface?

This question is often repeated. There is a rational answer to the given fact. This practice is not merely ridiculous like that of throwing a loaf of bread, or some [illegible] into the water to cause a dead body to float, and thus become visible. What is the answer?

The living human body is a very little lighter than water. If a person stands perpendicular in the water with his arms by his side, he will so float as to leave the upper part of his [illegible] and his nose out of water. Though mere flesh is heavier than water, the cavities of the body, as lungs, stomach, &c., being filled with air, the body as a whole is then lighter, and thus floats. In drowning, these cavities are filled with water, and most of the air expelled from them. Hence the body is now heavier than water and sinks to the bottom. Perhaps also there is a slight contraction of the fleshy parts by which the effect is aided. Certain it is, the drowned body goes to the bottom, because it is heavier than water.

When the water is cold, no chemical change takes place in the drowned body, or so little, that it will lie at the bottom through a winter, and not float till spring. This fact often occurs when drowning happens late in the autumn or in winter.

With sufficient warmth, chemical changes take place in the body, and gasses are developed; the body swells, and becomes light enough to float. The strength of the muscles and integuments prevent the rapid enlargement of the body. Any force which shall operate on the body makes the parts give way and the enlargement more rapid.

An easy force to be applied, is the firing of cannon or heavy guns; near the water and the body, or directly upon the surface of the water, so that the impulse on and through the water to the body may cause the gases to expand it, so that it shall be lighter than water, and thus rise. There is adequate reason for the practice so common.

It is obvious that the explosion of cannon produce the desired effect, immediately upon the drowning, not until the circumstances have taken place, already mentioned, and have prepared the body to be more rapidly enlarged by the influence of the explosion. Hence it is that the firing of cannon the third or fourth day, produces the desired result, when it failed on the first and second, or until several days have elapsed.—*Roch American*

A FEW WORDS ABOUT JURIES.—A large number of reflecting citizens are far from being satisfied about the practical working of our present jury system and its tendencies. A friend of ours, a merchant and a gentleman of superior intelligence and sound judgment, who recently was upon the jury for the term of the Circuit Court, declared the other day in our hearing that he would far rather dispense with a jury in any litigation in which he might be involved, and have his case decided by the Court, than leave it to the verdict of a jury, as juries are generally constituted. He referred to commercial cases. Another gentleman had recently the misfortune to be upon the jury during the term of a criminal Court, and although he did not speak so severely of criminal juries, he said enough to satisfy us that the institution is not properly valued among us. We could give some illustrations of the evil, which we think would bring the reader to the same mind as our friends respectively, whose sentiments we have echoed. From this we shall refrain, however, our object being to work a reformation of practice under the institution, and not to abolish the institution itself. One instance we deem it right to mention; we believe it to be but one of many, and it shows the kind of error which juries are prone to commit.

Rent was sued for by a legal gentleman. The justice of the claim was so apparent to eleven of the jurors that their decision was promptly made. The twelfth demurred, and when pressed for his reason, he gave it with all frankness—the plaintiff was a lawyer, all lawyers were grasping, unjust men; and he would not be a party to putting money into a lawyer's pocket. This, in effect, was his argument for refusing to concur in the verdict his fellow jurors desired to render, without further loss of time. In vain he was reasoned with. He admitted that the evidence seemed all clear enough for the plaintiff, &c., but could not be made to comprehend that it was his duty to give his verdict according to the evidence before him. In other words, he thought that it was part of his duty to insist upon the introduction of his own views of the plaintiff's profession as part of the elements of the case. The jury were discharged without agreeing. Subsequently this jury man conversed with the plaintiff, as certain of his motives and reasons for suing for his claim, and the prejudice thus removed, the non-concurring member of the jury acknowledged that he had erred. There was not the shadow of reason to believe that on his part there was any intention or dereliction of duty as imposed by the oath he had taken. His fault was obstinacy combined with an inability to discriminate between his views as a man and his duty as a juror. Numerous instances will recur to the memory of the reader in which, beyond all reasonable dispute, the verdict of the jury in criminal cases has been influenced by sympathy for the criminal more than was consistent with the sacred obligation to give a verdict *according to the testimony*.

What has contributed to this imperfect and injurious operation of the jury system? The answer might well be.—Many things. We cannot now enumerate them all, nor is it necessary. Our own belief is that the growing practice of making frivolous and unreasonable objections to the qualifications of jurors has had much to do with the admitted deterioration in the quality of juries. It seems to us impossible that the spectators in Court, among whom are those already empannelled and others liable hereafter to serve, can listen to the foolish objections, and the transparent sophistries by which the forming of a jury is so often impeded, without having their respect for the institution diminished, and their belief in its solemn responsibilities and obligations frittered away. In this respect our judiciary are not free from blame. Some of them have practically taught that reading the newspaper reports of a case, and forming a private opinion from such data, are disqualifications for the sworn duties of a juror.

This absurd dogma we conceive, has been "a heavy blow and sad discouragement" to the popular estimation of the solemnity, sanctity and obligatory character of the juror's oath. It has operated in this way. The juror is asked whether he has read such reports and whether he has formed any opinion. To both questions he replies in the affirmative, adding probably, especially if questioned, that he is still prepared to hear the sworn testimony of the witnesses on both sides, and to alter his opinion if the evidence warrants it. And if this sentiment is not expressed, its possession ought to be conceded to the juror. The fact, however, is otherwise. The court has ruled that such a man is disqualified; by which it in effect proclaims that, in its judgment, the imposition of a sacred oath upon a fellow citizen will not even have sufficient influence upon his mind to induce candor, and dispose him to admit a conviction resulting from a stubborn array of facts elicited on oath. The language in effect is, "Stand down, sir; you had no business to read," [which of itself is a most absurd and incongruous decision,] "and having read and formed an opinion you are disqualified; we do not consider a sacred oath a sufficiently powerful obligation to make a man change his opinion, even though he sees cause."

This is the practical teaching of such a decision, and of many of the decisions in which jurors are disqualified. They are so many declarations of want of confidence in the obligations of an oath. Their injurious effect upon the public mind cannot be doubted. They tend to depreciate the value and sacredness of an oath in popular esteem. They teach that both court and counsel, and of course those who instruct counsel, are reluctant to trust to the oath that the juror solemnly takes. The sentiment, from being so often repeated, is rooted in the minds of those who form juries, and they almost insensibly receive the same unworthy views of the sanctity of the solemn obligations they before God assume.

Here indeed is the radical evil, and it is a growing one. Its remedy is in the hands of the judiciary. They must first display greater confidence in the virtue of a solemn oath and compel counsel so to do. Next, they must admit no opportunity of correcting the now vitiated public sentiment with respect to the duties of jurors, and the high responsibility that rests upon them. They, in scarcely a lower degree than our legislators and judges, are conservators of laws. Certain great principles must be kept prominently before the minds of juries, who must be accustomed to observe them;—as that their verdict must in all cases be given upon the evidence alone; that in criminal trials no sympathy with the circumstances or wrongs of the person on trial must be allowed to impair the force of direct testimony; that mitigating circumstances are to be considered, not in connection with the question of guilt or innocence, but with the reference of punishment; and that the law is to be held supreme as, through a jury, a competent vindicator of all wrongs.

With reference to a certain class of cases, of which there is naturally a strong tendency on the part of honorable minded jurors to allow their sympathies to mislead them, the following sentiments, recently uttered by a distinguished judge, are eminently deserving of consideration.

It is my duty further to state to you, most solemnly, that these facts, admitting them to be fully proved in all their atrocity, might not, cannot, in the absence of insanity, consistently with your duty which one rather in the scale, in fixing the legal guilt or innocence of the delinquent. The moment society is disorganized, the power of individuals to redress personal grievances shall cease. There always have been, and from the very imperfection of human law, always must be, even the best government and wisest laws, a [illegible] of wrongs for which the law fails to afford adequate redress, and which never can, and never must, be redressed by violence. A daughter is seduced from the paths of virtue; shame and reproach are brought upon a family; husband and a father, are lured into the haunts of vice and intemperance, rendered bankrupt in property and reputation, his wife abandoned and children outcast; wrongs like these are around us, almost unnoticed, from their very familiarity. The law affords no adequate redress, and yet has it ever been heard that the injured wife or ruined husband, or ruined children, may redress their wrongs by violence or force? Let this idea, gentlemen, be once admitted, and we cease to be a government of law, and become a government of force. In every government, either law or force must govern. If force prevails, the law ceases. Let this be once admitted as the principle on which justice is to be administered, and you loose at once the restraints of society: you proclaim the government of force, and the scenes which have occurred in the streets of San Francisco may be again seen in the squares of this city.

WHAT IS MESMERISM?

Blackwood, for July, has an elaborate article on "What is Mesmerism?" The conclusion is thus expressed:

"The true explanation of mesmerism is to be found, as we have said, in the weakness or infatuation of human nature itself. No other causes are at all necessary to account for the mesmeric prostration. There is far more craziness, both physical and moral, in man than he usually give himself credit for. The reservoir of human folly may be in a great measure secret, but it is always full; and all that silliness whether of mind or body, at any time wants, is *to get its cue*. In soft and weak natures, whose nervous system [illegible] seizures, [illegible] [illegible]

Maryland Historical Society

The Maryland State Colonization Society Papers

XII. Newspapers
B. Liberia Herald

February 1842(XI,4)--February 18,1857(n.s. VII,4)

1852

NEW SERIES NO 2